



REQUEST FOR CEO APPROVAL¹

PROJECT TYPE: Medium-sized Project

TYPE OF TRUST FUND: GEF Trust Fund

PART I: PROJECT INFORMATION

Project Title: Support to Preparation of the Second National Biosafety Reports to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety-:Latin America, Caribbean and Pacific Regions			
Country(ies):	Latin America - 21 Parties Bahamas, Belize, Bolivia, Brazil, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El-Salvador, Grenada, Guatemala, Guyana, Honduras, Mexico, Nicaragua, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Suriname, Venezuela, Caribbean - 7 Parties Antigua & Barbuda, Barbados, Dominica, Saint Kitts & Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent & the Grenadines, Trinidad & Tobago, Pacific - 11 Parties Fiji, Kiribati, Maldives, Marshall Islands, Nauru, Niue, Palau, Papua New Guinea, Samoa, Solomon Islands, Tonga [39 Eligible Parties]	GEF Project ID: ²	4525
GEF Agency(ies):	UNEP (select) (select)	GEF Agency Project ID:	00734
Other Executing Partner(s):	Country National Executinig Agencies	Submission Date:	2011-05-06
GEF Focal Area (s):	Biodiversity	Project Duration(Months)	12 months
Name of Parent Program (if applicable): For SFM/REDD+ <input type="checkbox"/>		Agency Fee (\$):	92,687

A. FOCAL AREA STRATEGY FRAMEWORK³

Focal Area Objectives	Expected FA Outcomes	Expected FA Outputs	Trust Fund	Grant Amount (\$)	Cofinancing (\$)
(select) BD-5	Outcome 5.1	Output 5.1	GEF TF	889,061	780,000
(select) BD-5			(select)		
(select) (select)			(select)		
(select) (select)			(select)		
(select) (select)			(select)		
(select) (select)			(select)		
(select) (select)			(select)		
(select) (select)			(select)		
(select) (select)			(select)		
(select) (select)	Others		(select)		

¹ It is important to consult the GEF Preparation Guidelines when completing this template

² Project ID number will be assigned by GEFSEC.

³ Refer to the [Focal Area/LDCF/SCCF Results Framework](#) when filling up the table in item A.

(select)		(select)	
(select)		(select)	
(select)		(select)	
(select)		(select)	
(select)		(select)	
(select)		(select)	
(select)		(select)	
Total Co-financing			780,000

D. GEF/LDCF/SCCF RESOURCES REQUESTED BY AGENCY, FOCAL AREA AND COUNTRY¹

GEF Agency	Type of Trust Fund	Focal Area	Country Name/ Global	(in \$)		
				Grant Amount (a)	Agency Fee (b) ²	Total c=a+b
UNEP	GEF TF	Biodiversity	Regional-Africa	926,871	92,687	1,019,558
(select)	(select)	(select)				0
(select)	(select)	(select)				0
(select)	(select)	(select)				0
(select)	(select)	(select)				0
(select)	(select)	(select)				0
(select)	(select)	(select)				0
(select)	(select)	(select)				0
(select)	(select)	(select)				0
(select)	(select)	(select)				0
Total Grant Resources				926,871	92,687	1,019,558

E. CONSULTANTS WORKING FOR TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE COMPONENTS:

Component	Estimated Person Weeks	Grant Amount (\$)	Cofinancing (\$)	Project Total (\$)
Local consultants*			0	0
International consultants*	39.00	97,500	0	97,500
Total		97,500	0	97,500

* Details to be provided in Annex C.

F. PROJECT MANAGEMENT COST

Cost Items	Total Estimated Person Weeks/Months	Grant Amount (\$)	Co-financing (\$)	Project Total (\$)
Local consultants*				0
International consultants*	7.80	19,500		19,500
Office facilities, equipment, vehicles and communications*				0
Travel*				0
Others**	Administration Support - 16 weeks	8,310		8,310
				0
Total		27,810	0	27,810

* Details to be provided in Annex C.

** For others, to be clearly specified by overwriting fields *(1) and *(2).

G. DOES THE PROJECT INCLUDE A “NON-GRANT” INSTRUMENT? No

(If non-grant instruments are used, provide in Annex E an indicative calendar of expected reflows to your Agency and to the GEF/LDCF/SCCF Trust Fund).

H. DESCRIBE THE BUDGETED M & E PLAN:

The project will follow United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) and Global Environment Facility (GEF) minimum requirements for project monitoring, reporting, evaluation processes and procedures. Substantive and financial project reporting requirements are an integral part of the UNEP legal instrument, the Small Scale Funding Agreement (SSFA) that will be signed by the National Executing Agencies and UNEP. The Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) process will include an end of project assesment undertaken by independent review teams. The project will be evaluated on the basis of: execution performance, output delivery, and project impact. Evaluation of the project's success in achieving its outcomes will be monitored continuously throughout the project through the progress reports, and the final evaluation. This MSP is under an expedited process and hence will not require a budgeted plan as per GEF policies, but the project will capture lessons learnt and an independent evaluation to address M&E. A budget allocation is provided under component 3 on "capturing lessons, global analysis and evaluation this will be done as a consolidated desk review analysis for the three umbrella MSPs to ensure efficiency, economies of scale and maximum use of resources.

PART II: PROJECT JUSTIFICATION

A. DESCRIPTION OF THE CONSISTENCY OF THE PROJECT WITH:

A.1.1. The [GEF focal area/LDCF/SCCF strategies](#):

This project is consistent with the **GEF 5** Biodiversity focal area strategic objective five (SO5): Integrate CBD Obligations into National Planning Processes through Enabling Activities. Under SO5, Enabling activity support could be provided for revising National Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plans (NBSAPs) in line with the CBD's new strategic plan to be adopted at COP-10, national reporting, and implementation of guidance related to the Clearing House Mechanism (CHM) with support from the Focal Area set aside funds.

In context of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety (CPB), the national reporting will also provide an update on the status of implementation of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety and hence facilitate intervention measures under Strategic Objective 3: Build capacity for the implementation of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety. The GEF strategy prioritizes the implementation of activities that are identified in country stock-taking analyses and in the COP/MOP guidance to the GEF, in particular the key elements in the *Updated Action Plan for Building Capacities for the Effective Implementation of the CPB*, agreed to at the third COP serving as the Meeting of the Parties to the CPB (COP-MOP-3). The overarching goal is the improvement of decision-making for the regulation of Living Modified Organisms (LMOs) and CPB implementation, the main objective of this project is to assist GEF-Eligible Parties to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety to prepare and make timely submission of their Second National

Reports on measures that each Party has taken to implement the Protocol in line with Article 33.

A.1.2. For projects funded from LDCF/SCCF: the LDCF/SCCF eligibility criteria and priorities:

N/A

A.2. National strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, if applicable, i.e. NAPAS, NAPs, NBSAPs, national communications, TNAs, NIPs, PRSPs, NPFE, etc. :

All the 39 participating countries have ratified the CPB are therefore obligated as per the no reservation provision in article 38 to implement every obligation under the CPB. The implementation of article 33 focuses on monitoring and reporting of measures put in place to facilitate the implementation of the CPB. In addition the implementation of the obligations is guided by Decisions of the Conference of Parties Serving as the Meeting of the Parties (COP-MOP). The National Biosafety Reporting processes provide data to facilitate the five yearly assessment and review of implementation of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety as required by article 35 of the Protocol. These periodic assessments give data to facilitate development of action plans for implementation of the Protocol. The National Biosafety Reporting is of direct relevance to the development and implementation of the National Biosafety Frameworks (NBFs) as per the obligation of articles 2.1, 22 and related articles. The NBFs of the referenced countries are captured on <http://www.unep.org/biosafety/National%20Biosafety%20frameworks.aspx> and <https://bch.cbd.int> In addition, the Biosafety National Reports are of direct relevance to the review and update of the NBSAPs which provides an overarching policy direction to the implementation of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety

B. PROJECT OVERVIEW:

B.1. Describe the baseline project and the problem that it seeks to address:

Parties are required under Article 33 of the CPB, to submit National Reports on the status of their compliance, every four years. In its decision BS-I/9, the COP-MOP adopted a reporting format and requested Parties to submit reports every four years. The decision also called for an interim report to be submitted to the Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity (SCBD) two years after entry into force of the Protocol on the 11 September 2005. The interim reports can be found at http://bch.cbd.int/protocol/cpb_natreports.shtml#natrep0 The major conclusion of the analysis of the interim report was that [Assessment of the practical elements of implementation of some of the operational provisions of the Protocol is difficult in many cases, since no concrete experience is available on how the frameworks will be operationalized; for example, no countries have reported on decisions taken under the advance informed agreement procedure for importing living modified organisms for intentional introduction into the environment]

At its third meeting, the COP-MOP after consideration of the analysis of the interim reports as submitted by the Executive Secretary, adopted BS-III/14 with a reporting format for the first regular national report on implementation of the Protocol. The reporting format outlined a schedule and the process for the preparation and synthesis of the reports for consideration at the fourth COP-MOP meeting (see http://bch.cbd.int/protocol/cpb_natreports.shtml#natrep1).

At its fourth meeting, the COP-MOP considered the analysis of first national reports prepared by the SCBD. In its decision BS-IV/14, COP/MOP 4 requested the Secretariat to repeat the analysis of the first national reports submitted after the deadline and make the analysis available through the BCH. It also requested the Secretariat to propose improvements to the reporting format from experiences of the first national reports, the recommendations of the Compliance Committee and suggestions made by Parties, for consideration at COP-MOP 5. In addition, the COP-MOP through decision BS IV/14 para 6 urged the Global Environment Facility (GEF) to make financial resources available with a view to enable eligible Parties to prepare their national reports. A first analysis of the information contained in the first national reports and a summary of the responses were made available to Parties in documents UNEP/CBD/BS/COP-MOP/4/13 and UNEP/CBD/BS/COP-MOP/4/INF/11. A revised analysis (requested by decision BS-IV/14) is available in document UNEP/CBD/BS/CC/5/2 and refers to information contained in the first national reports received by the Secretariat prior to 18 August 2008.

In the analysis of the First National reports carried out by the Secretariat, it became apparent that the information submitted did not adequately reflect or establish baselines for subsequent assessment and review of the effectiveness of the Protocol. Aside of the low compliance and the need to address gaps in the implementation of the National Biosafety Frameworks, strengthened national capacity in thematic issues such as the Advance Informed Agreement procedures, Socio economic considerations, Handling, Transport, Packaging and Identification and Risk Assessment/Risk Management were identified as key issues for redress to facilitate implementation of the Protocol. Appendix 11 to this project document shows a listing of parties who met the obligation and prepared their national reports and Appendix 12 shows a summary analysis of parties that met their obligations and the indicative numbers of envisaged parties that would require support. In decision BS-IV/14, the COP-MOP requested the Secretariat to propose improvements to the reporting format

At its fifth meeting, the COP-MOP in decision BS-V/14 welcomed the reporting format for the national report on the implementation of the Protocol proposed by the Secretariat and requested Parties to use it for the preparation of their second national reports, through a consultative process involving all relevant stakeholders. It also encouraged Parties to respond to all questions in the reporting format in order to facilitate the establishment of baselines for subsequent assessment and review of the effectiveness of the Protocol and also for the work of the Compliance Committee. Parties that encounter difficulty in completing and submitting their national report on time were encouraged to seek assistance from the Secretariat or the Compliance Committee, and/or make use of the roster of biosafety experts [BS V/14 paras 4 – 7]. The GEF was also requested to make financial resources available to eligible Parties for the preparation of their second national reports as per BS V/5 para 4c. Furthermore, COP-MOP requested the Secretariat to organize an online forum and/or regional or sub-regional workshops on national reporting to assist Parties in the preparation of their national reports and exchange best practices and experience on the fulfillment of the monitoring and reporting obligations under the Protocol. As a response to the request to the GEF as a funding mechanism as captured in BS V/5, the GEF CEO and the Executive Secretary of the SCBD released two notifications on support for the second national reporting as follows: <http://www.cbd.int/doc/notifications/2011/ntf-2011-035-bs-en.pdf>; <http://www.cbd.int/doc/notifications/2011/ntf-2011-076-gef-biosafety-en.pdf> to GEF Operational Focal Points and National Focal Points for the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety.

According to decision BS-V/14, the second regular national report is to be submitted to the Secretariat, no later than 30th September 2011, in an official language of the United Nations through the BCH (see <http://bch.cbd.int/managementcentre/edit/CPBnationalreport2.shtml>). Parties are encouraged to respond to all questions in the reporting form. Complete information is required for the establishment of baseline data for the subsequent assessment and review processes of the Protocol as required for article 35 with guidance in BS V/15 as well as to measure progress in the implementation of the Biosafety Strategic Plan 2011 – 2020 (BS V/16).

In compiling the national reports, a three step approach is proposed as follows

Downloading of offline reporting form to gather data and organize information

Preparation of national reports through a consultative process involving all relevant stakeholders as appropriate.

Filling of the online form and submission by the BCH National Focal Points through the BCH.

BCH National Focal Points with limited Internet access may submit the completed offline form in MS Word format directly to the Secretariat, as an attachment to an e-mail together with a scanned copy of the first signed page.

In order to assist the Parties to meet their obligation under the Protocol in a timely and effective manner, the GEF funding support will be utilized through UNEP to assist the Parties by giving the Parties the necessary technical advisory support in data collection, consultations with the relevant stakeholders, interpretation of Protocol related issues and in the compilation, review and submission of the report in the required format. This technical support

will be provided both by UNEP and its external Regional Advisors who will be deployed on a needs-basis. These Advisors are the legacy of the first global BCH Project which trained over sixty people to become regional resource persons on biosafety, giving rise to the Regional Advisors network. These experts reside in their respective regions and as a multi-lingual, multi-cultural corps of trainers, possess a high level of cultural sensitivity. Members of this network are able to advise and work with a wide range of stakeholders from different backgrounds, often in the local language, and they understand well the intricacies of inter-Governmental coordination and public consultation processes. Their availability for short-term assignments and their familiarity with many Government biosafety focal points also facilitate access to their advisory services. The Regional Advisors Network continues to be part of UNEP's dedicated core of biosafety support to countries in its delivery of capacity building interventions. UNEP continues to update the skill sets and knowledge of the support network

The proposed Regional Medium Sized Project (MSP) will be used to group several eligible parties requesting for enabling activity support from the Focal Area Set Aside funds to assist 39 Eligible Parties in Latin America, the Caribbean and Pacific Regions to meet the obligations of article 33. This MSP will be accompanied by 2 further MSP ("clones") which altogether will cover of all eligible Parties through a GEF expedited process to support the proposed MSPs through which small grants will be disbursed to eligible parties to meet the second national biosafety reporting obligation.

The logic for this kind of grouping is to take advantage of commonalities of culture (eg. Language) and operational efficiency in terms of project size to enable UNEP provide rapid and efficient technical support working with its regional advisory support in the regions in Arabic, French, English, Russian and Spanish. The expected results, key deliverables and bench marks are captured in Appendices 5 – 6. The main criteria for taking part in the project are;

- i. Being eligible as a Party to access GEF funding support;
- ii. Submission of a letter of endorsement indicating interest in the proposed project concept.

A sample letter of endorsement is attached as Appendix 10.

B. 2. [Incremental /Additional cost reasoning](#): describe the incremental (GEF Trust Fund) or additional (LDCF/SCCF) activities requested for GEF/LDCF/SCCF financing and the associated [global environmental benefits](#) (GEF Trust Fund) or associated adaptation benefits (LDCF/SCCF) to be delivered by the project:

In the absence of GEF funds: As already emphasized, reporting is a party obligation under Article 33 of the Protocol. Guided by the no reservation clause in article 38, it is mandatory for the reporting to be done. From the analysis of the first reports, If GEF funds are not provided, countries would "self-finance" the preparation of their Second National Reports. However past experience has shown from the first and revised analysis of the first national reports (http://bch.cbd.int/protocol/cpb_natreports.shtml) that this method would be the least effective. The need for both financial and technical assistance is clearly highlighted in the analysis. As happened in the first reporting cycle, some countries might not submit their reports at all, while in other cases countries may be very late in submitting their reports which could possibly affect the data size and quality required for the follow up work on article 35 – Assessment and Review. Without the GEF Funding support, some of the parties may not be able to generate the required data and stakeholder inputs and the resultant baseline data might not be representative and of good quality for the required follow up analysis as per article 35. In the African Region out of 42 eligible parties only 8 submitted their interim reports and subsequently only 24 submitted their 1st National Report.

With GEF funding support: Financing this project through an expedited MSP is seen as the most cost effective approach as the GEF financing support coupled with UNEP's technical advisory support to the Parties will ensure that the CPB will receive more reports of a higher quality which will provide the needed data for

analysis required in meeting the requirements of articles 33, 35 and also provide a relevant data for the implementation of the new Biosafety Strategy 2011-2020 as adopted (BS V/16). The reports will also provide a reliable data for the implementation of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety in particular its decision-making processes and supportive mechanisms of the COP-MOP processes. Without a significant number of national reports, the SCBD as mandated will not be able to have a good baseline for the assessment and review process under article 35 which is needed to help the COP/MOP provide adequate guidance and an updated action for implementation of the Protocol at various levels.

Fully Incremental: Enabling Activity funding is full cost funding provided by the GEF, i.e. fully incremental, and is therefore exempted from mandatory co-financing. Still, this project will demonstrate the ability to leverage co-financing at country level through in kind contributions from the countries as reflected in appendix 2.

Global Environment Benefits: Once the reports have been uploaded to the Biosafety Clearing House (BCH), the results will be analysed and these will provide a simultaneous and comparable snapshot of how countries in the Africa Region are implementing the CPB. It will also provide and give guidance on potential areas for capacity building interventions which can be used for an updated action plan for the implementation of the CPB. This project is an intervention in alignment with the GEF’s mandate to generate global benefits by paying for the incremental costs of planning and foundational enabling activities that countries implement to generate global biodiversity benefits. The contents of the 2nd National Report will greatly assist the CPB and the countries plan for their biosafety related actions and could even generate future projects as a result.

B.3. Describe the socioeconomic benefits to be delivered by the Project at the national and local levels, including consideration of gender dimensions, and how these will support the achievement of global environment benefits (GEF Trust Fund) or adaptation benefits (LDCF/SCCF). As a background information, read [Mainstreaming Gender at the GEF.”](#)

The format of the Second National Report prompts parties to provide information on what socio-economic considerations arise from the impact of LMOs based on article 26.1 of the CPB. This provides an opening for Parties to identify issues for consideration in the biosafety regulatory processes to facilitate decision making. While drafting of the second national report may not have direct benefits, it is the “off shoot” policies that are developed as a result of this report, that may be of benefit to parties e.g. drafting of regulations that ensure introduction of LMOs does not negatively impact on a countries’ population or provide data to guide national processes for enforcement of the national biosafety framework.

B.4 Indicate risks, including climate change risks that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved, and if possible, propose measures that address these risks to be further developed during the project design:

Identified Risks	Rating	Mitigation Measure
Lack of political will on biosafety related issues	High	Political interest will be sustained through development of consultative meetings which emphasis the national imperatives of meeting treaty obligations and the expected outputs to drive the national biosafety agenda
Lack data and/or non implementation of some obligations of the Protocol	Medium	Stakeholders will be carefully identified and encouraged to provide all the biosafety related data for follow up analysis to capture those of relevance to the biosafety protocol, emphasis will also be given to data generators that indicating where no data exists or exists is a compliance issue and must therefore be addressed

Inability to address all the questions in the format or limited access to the internet	Medium	Relevant parties will be provided technical advisory support in interpreting the articles of the Protocol (including guidance on compliance to reporting) and on how to describe national progress in relation to individual articles.
--	--------	--

The critical assumptions made by the proposal are that:

- i. The necessary political will to develop the Second National Report exists in the countries;
- ii. Stakeholders will show interest or have vested interest in Biosafety and would maintain their engagement with the issues;
- iii. Increased capacity and improved understanding of Biosafety issues will lead to (a) adoption of appropriate national Biosafety frameworks and (b) effective engagement in the implementation of the national framework and the Protocol leading to outcomes that advance the interests of the Parties and the objectives of the Protocol.

Should these assumptions be misplaced, or their validity change over the course of the project, this could have an impact on how the objectives will be achieved. The purpose of the assistance is to help countries effectively meet the requirements of Article 33. Reporting is an obligation under the Protocol and the countries must submit the reports so as to ensure compliance with the Protocol.

B.5. Identify key stakeholders involved in the project including the private sector, civil society organizations, local and indigenous communities, and their respective roles, as applicable:

The project will build on the experience that countries have already gained, to effectively secure the involvement of national authorities, non-governmental organizations, private sector and research institutions and local communities through the ongoing GEF projects on Development and Implementation of National Biosafety Frameworks and assistance on “Building Capacity for Effective Participation in the BCH” and other related biosafety projects. The project will be carried out through data collection, consultative workshops and interactive meetings at the national level. The various governmental departments serving as competent authorities will be consulted so as to establish the baseline information necessary in completing the National Report.

Possible stakeholders, depending on in country dynamics may include the following:

Potential Stakeholders	Expected Roles
Government Ministries/Departments and Agencies [e.g. Environment, Science and Technology, Health, Agriculture, Finance, Trade]	Development and implementation of policy and regulatory frameworks, implementation of regulatory functions including monitoring and compliance with Protocol related matters
Academia [Universities and Research Institutions]	Biosafety research and training including laboratory analytical functions to support regulatory agencies
Civil Society Groups	Consumer related issues, public engagement and socio economic others
Standards Institutions	Development of standards to facilitate work of regulatory and development agencies

B.6. Outline the coordination with other related initiatives:

The UNEP GEF Global Projects on the Development of National Biosafety Frameworks (NBF) and

implementation of NBFs were designed to assist countries to develop and implement their National Biosafety Frameworks so that they can comply with the CPB. Building on the success of these initiatives, countries that have developed and implemented their NBFs can now use these instruments as the information feedstock together with the Biosafety Tracking Tools developed for GEF 4 projects as a baseline to review and capture data required for the development of the Second National Report. This effort will in turn provide a timely contribution to those UNEP/GEF projects for NBF Implementation in the targeted regions that were recently approved and are due to begin execution during 2011 as an adaptive feedback measure.

Another related initiative is the UNEP-GEF Project for Continued Enhancement of Building Capacity for Effective Participation in the Biosafety Clearing House (BCH). The overall objective of this project is to assist eligible countries in building and strengthening national capacity needed to enable access and use of the BCH in order to implement their obligations under the Cartagena Protocol, currently the 2nd iteration of this project is underway indicating that countries require capacity investments to assist them comply with the protocol. Development of the 2nd National Report project is designed along similar lines as the report will track the results of the capacity building investments in the participating countries and provide this information to the Central Portal of the BCH.

The proposed project intervention is also related to preparation of National Biodiversity Reports and the National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plans (NBSAP) both through the fundamental objective of conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity and also by the fact that the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety is a subsidiary instrument on the Convention on Biological Diversity. The NBSAPs also give strategies and actions on all biodiversity related issues including biosafety. The National Biosafety Reporting could therefore provide additional data required in updating or revising the NBSAPs in areas related to the safe use and transboundary movement of LMOs that may have adverse impacts on biodiversity or human health (see <http://www.cbd.int/nbsap/>).

C. GEF AGENCY INFORMATION:

C.1 Confirm the co-financing amount the GEF agency brings to the project:

The co-financing amount for the project will be in kind contribution of \$780,000 from Governments. This total is based on the calculation of \$20,000 per participating country.

C.2 How does the project fit into the GEF agency's program (reflected in documents such as UNDAF, CAS, etc.) and staff capacity in the country to follow up project implementation:

This project falls under the UNEP Medium-term Strategy-2010–2013 sub programme on Environmental Governance whose objective is that environmental governance at country, regional and global levels is strengthened to address agreed priorities. Select UNEP expected accomplishments for this sub programme relevant to this project are: (a) That the United Nations system demonstrates increasing coherence in international decision-making processes related to the environment, including those under multilateral environmental agreements (MEA);- implementing this and other MEA defined projects will help UNEP achieve this accomplishment (b) That States increasingly implement their environmental obligations and achieve their environmental priority goals, targets and objectives through strengthened laws and institutions- The biosafety projects already implemented or ongoing direct a lot of assistance towards states in fulfilling the environmental obligation. In addition, UNEP through its MEA focal points have been providing continuous support to the implementation of MEAs especially in the area of liaison assistance to the wider UNEP and its partners and this will be further boosted through direct call up assistance on Biosafety Protocol related issues. This is in addition to in house expertise on the Biosafety Protocol provided by the designated UNEP Task Managers.

PART III: INSTITUTIONAL COORDINATION AND SUPPORT

A. INSTITUTIONAL ARRANGEMENT:

For project execution, the following entities will be involved;

- (a) the Eligible parties
- (b) the Project Implementation Unit- DEPI which will co- execute with the countries
- (c) UNEP will make available its core of trained Regional Advisors to provide technical support function on Protocol related matters

The working relationship between these structures is depicted in Appendix 8

Project Management Unit

The Project Management Unit will-

- Review project progress with respect to objectives, strategies and work-plans;
- Liaise with any other relevant bodies for the benefit of the project;
- Advise on how best to mobilize further resources; and
- Monitor and ensure the timely and adequate flow of funds.

Regional Focal Point

A short term consultant will be engaged to provide liaison support work under the guidance of the designated UNEP Manager responsible for the different regions- Africa, Latin America, Caribbean, Pacific, Central and Eastern Europe, & Asia- Pacific and Latin America, the eligible parties, the regional advisors and the UNEP-GEF Biosafety Unit. They will carry out a coordination function to facilitate linkages with the countries.

Regional Advisors

The Regional Advisors system was set up by the UNEP-GEF Biosafety Unit in the year 2003. This system identified experts on the CPB as well as on Information Technology (IT), trained them on the use of the BCH. The Regional Advisors, who come from the same regions and are known “champions” of biosafety issues, were deployed to work with countries. They provide advisory support on their roles and obligations under the Protocol. The countries that benefit from the services of the Regional Advisors are the developing countries and countries with economies in transition. The countries are further grouped into regions and sub-regions namely the African Region, Asia & Pacific Region, Latin American & Caribbean region and the Central & Eastern Europe Region. The Regional Advisors understand the politics, language as well as the culture of the regions and have successfully represented UNEP-GEF in training countries on the use of the BCH and other biosafety related capacity building issues under the Development and Implementation Projects. This proposal for the Africa sub-Region, and the other two Umbrella MSPs (that will cover eligible parties within the other sub-regions), therefore envisages the use of the Regional Advisory service in assisting the countries during the consultation process and further compilation of the necessary information in the required format and submitting the National Reports to the BCH mainly as an online support and assisting Parties to capture lessons learnt. Travel is envisaged, but will be used as an approach to the minimum where there is really a felt need as UNEP envisages the national reporting as a purely national driven activity. However, it may become necessary due to the tight time constraints and earlier experiences in managing similar enabling activities. The terms of reference for the Regional Advisors are captured in Appendix 9. UNEP will ensure coordination between these three MSPs and the BCH-2 project (GEF 3856); including ensuring that there is no competition for RA time between the projects.

Eligible Parties

Eligible parties are the parties that have ratified the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety and are eligible to receive GEF support. As already emphasized all parties have an obligation under Article 33 of the protocol to submit their National Reports through the BCH highlighting progress made in implementation of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety. Parties are to submit the reports in the required format and by the **30th September 2011**. Parties are to hold national consultative meetings with the relevant stakeholders so as to gather the necessary information for the report.

B. PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENT:

UNEP-GEF BIOSAFETY UNIT

UNEP/GEF Biosafety Unit in the Division of Environment Policy and Implementation (DEPI) will be responsible for the implementation of the project and limited co-execution functions through the management and deployment of its Regional Advisory Services to support national execution process. This will ensure that the executing agencies execute the project in accordance with the objectives and activities outlined above. It will ensure consistency with GEF and UNEP policies and procedures, and will provide guidance on linkages with other related UNEP and GEF-funded activities. UNEP has been closely involved in biosafety. It supported the negotiation and entry into force of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety. UNEP provides secretarial support to three major biodiversity-related Multilateral Environmental Agreements: the CBD; CITES and CMS. UNEP has also provided support for capacity building activities related to the Convention on Biological Diversity. It has assisted more than 35 countries to prepare Biodiversity Country Studies and National Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plans and, through its Environmental Law Programme, UNEP continues to assist countries to adopt environmental regulations and legislations. UNEP has been recognized for its neutrality in the face of a contentious issue (biotechnology /biosafety /LMO commerce) and is regularly requested to provide direct technical assistance and facilitate multi-stakeholder involvement in biosafety. Over the past decade, UNEP has assisted more than 130 countries to develop national biosafety frameworks and to build national BCH capacity, as well as working with over 40 countries on national level implementation of these NBFs.

Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity (SCBD)

As per article 31 of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety, the SCBD is the secretariat charged with the administration of the Protocol and follow up on related COP/MOP processes. The results of the project support to the 2nd National Biosafety Reports will provide data to support the work of the Secretariat in the follow up analysis and the next step of Assessment and Review as per article 35. In that vein, the project team in UNEP will continuously liaise and work with the SCBD to facilitate delivery of the national reports including a first step review analysis. In addition, the project team will work with the SCBD and related partners to facilitate rapid response to the national processes.

The envisaged institutional arrangement is captured in Appendix 8.

PART IV: EXPLAIN THE ALIGNMENT OF PROJECT DESIGN WITH THE ORIGINAL PIF

N/A

PART V: APPROVAL/ENDORSEMENT BY GEF OPERATIONAL FOCAL POINT(S) AND GEF AGENCY(IES)


- A. RECORD OF ENDORSEMENT OF GEF OPERATIONAL FOCAL POINT(S) ON BEHALF OF THE GOVERNMENT(S):** (Please attach the [Operational Focal Point endorsement letter\(s\)](#) with this template. For SGP, use this [OFP endorsement letter](#)).

NAME	POSITION	MINISTRY	DATE (MM/dd/yyyy)

B. GEF AGENCY(IES) CERTIFICATION

This request has been prepared in accordance with GEF/LDCF/SCCF policies and procedures and meets the GEF/LDCF/SCCF criteria for CEO endorsement/approval of project.

Agency	Signature	Date	Project	Telephone	Email Address
--------	-----------	------	---------	-----------	---------------

Coordinator, Agency Name		<i>(Month, day, year)</i>	Contact Person		
Maryam Niamir-Fuller Director, GEF Coordination Office, UNEP		May 06, 2011	Alex Owusu- Biney	254-20- 7624066	Alex.Owusu- Biney@unep.org

ANNEX A: PROJECT RESULTS FRAMEWORK

Project Logical Framework and Objectively Verifiable Impact Indicators: Project Title: Support to the Preparation of the Second National Biosafety Reports

Objectives and Outcomes/Outputs	Objectively Verifiable Indicators	Means of Verification	Important Assumptions
Objective To assist GEF-Eligible Parties to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety to prepare and make timely submission of their Second National Reports on measures that each Party has taken to implement the Protocol in line with Article 33	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Stakeholders in each of the participating countries exhibit enhanced understanding of the protocol and its provisions. Each of the participating countries has in place a mechanism that will expedite the reporting process for the protocol. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A national report from a 100% eligible of Parties that have received GEF funds on the measures that each Party has taken to implement the CPB 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Stakeholders have a sustained interest in Biosafety Political will exists to effectively complete and submit the national report in a timely manner
Component 1 : Development of the Second National Reports			
Outcome 1: Enhanced Understanding by key stakeholders of their obligations under the Protocol and the implications for government and other stakeholders	Existing Biosafety-related capacity, policy basis and main stakeholders are identified;	Documentation on stakeholder analysis; Workshop/seminars reports; National reporting documents	Stakeholders have sustained interest in issues of biosafety and related obligations to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety
Output: (i)A national report from a 100% eligible Parties that have received GEF funds on the measures that each Party has taken to implement the CPB	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Main stakeholders are identified Stakeholder-specific information is produced and disseminated Increased levels of in country dialogue on the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A register of Biosafety stakeholders developed for each country. Number of Second National Reports uploaded on the BCH. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Stakeholders are willing to engage in discussions that will enrich the preparation and finalization of National Reports
Component 2 Technical Advisory support, review of reports and assistance to countries in the management of the reports			
Outcome 2: Increased quality of national reports submitted to the SCBD by Parties	Increased number of reporting countries to the CPB Higher quality of reports received by the SCBD	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A greater number of 2nd National Reports received at the SCBD compared to the 1st National Report 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Advisory Services, technical support and renewed formats will contribute sufficiently to raise quality of national reports
Output: (i)Inventory of country requests for technical assistance received at UNEP	As least 50% of participating countries send requests for technical support to UNEP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Emails or letters from countries requesting for support. Emails responding to countries from UNEP 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Countries will be open to their reports being analyzed by UNEP
Component 3' Global Analysis and Evaluation of National Reports			
Outcome 1: Global Analysis and Evaluation of National Reports	Increased quality of information content in the reports submitted to the SCBD	Evaluation Report	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Enough country requests for global analysis and evaluation will be received.
Output:	Recommendations of lessons learned	Questionnaires. Interview scripts and	A significant number of reports

Objectives and Outcomes/Outputs	Objectively Verifiable Indicators	Means of Verification	Important Assumptions
(i) Evaluation Report	utilized in guidelines for developing the 3 rd National Report	transcripts on desk review during the evaluation process.	submitted to the SCBD of a high quality to facilitate follow up analysis as required under article 35 of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety

ANNEX B: RESPONSES TO PROJECT REVIEWS (from GEF Secretariat and GEF Agencies, and Responses to Comments from Council at work program inclusion and the Convention Secretariat and STAP at PIF).

Project reviewed through the expedited processes via email, telephone and Skype discussions. All comments and guidance received from the GEF Sec and SCBD have been addressed including clarifications on the role of the Regional Advisers and the institutional arrangements within UNEP. Additional review comments received from GEF Sec has been addressed and is attached as Annex B2 below.

Annex B 2: UNEP Response to GEF Sec Review

Country/Region: Regional – Latin America, Caribbean and Pacific Regions
Project Title: Support to the Preparation of National Biosafety Reports to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety
GEFSEC Project ID: 4525
GEF-5 Focal Area Objective: BD5

GEF SEC Comments of April 21 2011	UNEP Response
<p>14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?</p> <p>Please make the following adjustments to the project framework:</p> <p>1) The expected output is "a national report from 100% of eligible Parties". We can not abide assuming a 10% failure rate at project start.</p> <p>2) Please eliminate the output on "lessons learned and snapshot analysis of national reports" and reduce the budget accordingly. See comments below on consulting costs. Please remove text associated with this output in the document.</p>	<p>i. The expected output has been changed to “a national report from 100% of eligible Parties that have received GEF Funds” but UNEP wants to place on record that with the timeline of 30th September 2011 in uploading national reports on the Central Portal of the BCH this is not a realistic target from our experience</p> <p>ii. The consultancy costs provided is guided by our experience with handling enabling activities, secondly the lessons learnt and snap shot analysis as discussed with the SCBD would provide opportunities for picking out issues at an earlier stage even before the work of article 35 starts, could also provide opportunities for updates and also guidance for further interventions to support follow up interventions as an adaptive feedback measure</p>
<p>17. Has the cost-effectiveness sufficiently been demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design approach as compared to alternative approaches to achieve similar benefits?</p> <p>Yes, except for the excessive budget for the Regional Advisors and the output on capturing lessons learned. As noted elsewhere in the review, please amend these items.</p>	<p>Budget for Regional Advisory support clarified as follows</p> <p>i. Yes, the allocation comes to 5 days per country.. From our experience, the requested support will vary under the broad 3 categories:</p> <p>a. . assistance in data collection [1.5 days];</p> <p>b. addressing queries during the consultative process in relation to protocol related issues [1.5] days</p>

	<p>c. review of the draft reports to ensure compliance on Biosafety Protocol related matters as a first level of review before validation and upload [2 days]. This is the reasoning for capturing the support provided as an inventory in output 1 under outcome 2, a data which can be generated from time allocation and mission reports through ANUBIS for verification. The process is envisaged on a need basis and in some circumstances the support might be above 5 days whilst in some it could be less, a similar approach was used during the BCH I project (15 days allocated per country) and was found to be useful. Within the time constraints and the principle of value addition and incremental reasoning, we envisage support from 4 – 6 regional advisors per region (Arabic, English, Russian, Spanish and French) to assist in the process (spread over the project duration). The envisaged activities are spelt out in the sample TOR in Appendix 9</p> <p>The \$20,000 will be disbursed as a grant, to be utilised in the three step process outlined in the project. Some parties will spend more resources on the consultative process and drafting the report and others on the data collection and they may or may not use independent national consultants. What will be provided will be over and above this national support to ensure quality of the final product as outlined in the incremental/additional cost reasoning.</p> <p>ii. The Output on capturing lessons learnt which had been merged with a global analysis and evaluation has been removed as indicated even though this would have been a two step approach to capture lessons learnt coupled with the evaluation at a minimal cost of less than \$600 per party to ensure economies of scale and maximization of resources. This approach as discussed with the Biosafety Programme of the SCBD could be a good approach and a filter to support the review process</p> <p>iii. It must be emphasized that additional execution cost over and above the \$20,000 grant per country is less than \$4000 covering technical support, evaluation and the 3% PMC. With the timelines and the envisaged operational hurdles from our experience, UNEP is of the opinion the additional cost is justifiable</p>
<p>21. Is the provided documentation consistent?</p>	<p>i. As far as allowable by the password protected template, spell check has been done and appropriate edits made based on the review, note also that as UNEP is a United Nations agency,</p>

<p>Please ensure that appropriate edits and changes are made based on the review.</p> <p>Spell check your document.</p>	<p>the United Nations Editorial Manual states that the standard for English language documents is British usage and Oxford spelling. (http://69.94.137.26/editorialcontrol/ed-guidelines/style/spelling.htm)</p>
<p>24. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?</p> <p>No. The amount of time per country for the use of the Regional Advisors is excessive. Please reduce to 3 days per country. In addition, please decide whether the Regional Advisors will provide their technical assistance via teleconference and on line or in-country and commit to that in the budget.</p>	<p>i. See comments under item 17. Support to such interventions under the broad framework of technical assistance could vary from Party to Party. In some cases it will be mainly through telecommuting, and in some cases will involve in-country support UNEP has indicated this approach in the text of the Request for CEO Approval, this is guided by our experience and practice in handling EAs as capacity varies from Party to Party.</p>
<p>27. Is the GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding level for project management cost appropriate?</p> <p>Please calculate the project management cost to be 3% exactly as agreed</p>	<p>i. Changes effected as requested on the PMC</p>
<p>30. Is the budget (GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding and co-financing) per objective adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?</p> <p>No.</p> <p>i. Please reduce the budget for technical advisory support reducing the time allotted for the regional advisors per country from 5 days to 3 days.</p> <p>ii. Please eliminate the budget allocated for the lessons learned and analysis for 9.28 person weeks in Annex C.</p> <p>iii. GEF will not pay for the IT</p>	<p>i. See comments under item 17</p> <p>ii. The reference activity on lessons learnt and global analysis as captured under section H on Monitoring and Evaluation is part of the evaluation process. This is removed and captured under evaluation</p> <p>iii. References to ANUBIS removed</p> <p>iv. The Regional Focal Point will provide liaison function and assist in the execution and provide linkages including follow up and will devote time equivalent 1 day per</p>

<p>expert for ANUBIS database reconfiguration, please delete.</p> <p>iv. GEF will not pay for regional focal point support, please delete that from Annex C.</p> <p>v. With regards to the explanation for Travel in Annex C, please decide on how the TA will be provided by the regional advisors, either on-line, teleconference, etc and develop a budget accordingly.</p>	<p>party. Our experience from the BCH II project has shown this approach as a useful and quick response mechanism and regional coordination tool. It also ensures the needed linkages and partnerships through the networks, established through the MEA processes as an execution support role.</p> <p>At this stage, UNEP wants to emphasize that the options available for such a support would involve teleconferencing and possible direct visits to the country, guided by our experience with the BCH, the actual support envisaged has been clearly stated both under the Regional Advisory Support and also in the terms of reference under Appendix 9</p>
<p>32. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?</p> <p>Yes, but please eliminate the budget allocation under component two for lessons learned and global analysis that is referenced in Section H</p>	<p>i. See comments under item 30</p>
<p>37. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?</p> <p>No. Numerous issues have been raised. Please revise and resubmit.</p>	<p>i. Issues raised have either been addressed or in some cases additional justification has been provided</p>

ANNEX C: CONSULTANTS TO BE HIRED FOR THE PROJECT USING GEF/LDCF/SCCF RESOURCES

<i>Position Titles</i>	<i>\$/ Person Week*</i>	<i>Estimated Person Weeks**</i>	<i>Tasks To Be Performed</i>
For Project Management			
Local			
Administration support	519	16	To provide administrative and operational support to the execution of the project
International			
Regional Focal Point Support	2,500	7.8	To provide in country follow up and liaison functions and also address additional queries in support of project execution.
Justification for travel, if any:			
For Technical Assistance			
Local			
International			
Regional Advisory Service - [1 week=5 days per party]	2,500	39	To provide support on i. Interpretation of biosafety protocol articles and answering questions ii. Assist in accessing data iii. Guidance on optimizing consultation and coordination processes iv. Review of final draft national reports
Justification for travel, if any: Travel is envisaged, but will be used as an approach to the minimum where there is really a felt need as UNEP envisages the national reporting as a purely national driven activity. However, it may become necessary due to the tight time constraints. Possible TOT at Nairobi or emergency travel budget will come from the allocation for the Regional Advisory Service.			

* Provide dollar rate per person week. ** Total person weeks needed to carry out the tasks.

ANNEX D: STATUS OF IMPLEMENTATION OF PROJECT PREPARATION ACTIVITIES AND THE USE OF FUNDS

- A. EXPLAIN IF THE PPG OBJECTIVE HAS BEEN ACHIEVED THROUGH THE PPG ACTIVITIES UNDERTAKEN.
- B. DESCRIBE FINDINGS THAT MIGHT AFFECT THE PROJECT DESIGN OR ANY CONCERNS ON PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION, IF ANY:
- C. PROVIDE DETAILED FUNDING AMOUNT OF THE PPG ACTIVITIES AND THEIR IMPLEMENTATION STATUS IN THE TABLE BELOW:

<i>Project Preparation Activities Approved</i>	<i>Implementation Status</i>	<i>GEF/LDCF/SCCF Amount (\$)</i>				<i>Cofinancing (\$)</i>
		<i>Amount Approved</i>	<i>Amount Spent To date</i>	<i>Amount Committed</i>	<i>Uncommitted Amount*</i>	
	(Select)					
	(Select)					
	(Select)					
	(Select)					
	(Select)					
	(Select)					
	(Select)					
	(Select)					
Total		0	0	0	0	0

* Any uncommitted amounts should be returned to the GEF Trust Fund. This is not a physical transfer of money, but achieved through reporting and netting out from disbursement request to Trustee. Please indicate expected date of refund transaction to Trustee.

ANNEX E: CALENDAR OF EXPECTED REFLOWS (if non-grant instrument is used)

Provide a calendar of expected reflows to the GEF/LDCF/SCCF Trust Fund or to your Agency (and/or revolving fund that will be set up)

List of Appendices

- Appendix 1: Budget by project components and UNEP budget lines
- Appendix 2: Co-financing by source and UNEP budget lines
- Appendix 3: Results Framework
- Appendix 4: Work plan and timetable
- Appendix 5: Key deliverables and benchmarks
- Appendix 6: Summary of reporting requirements and responsibilities
- Appendix 7: Standard Terminal Evaluation TOR
- Appendix 8: Decision-making flowchart and organizational chart
- Appendix 9: Terms of Reference for Regional Advisors
- Appendix 10: Sample letter of Endorsement
- Appendix 11: List of Eligible Parties
- Appendix 12: Summary of status of reporting by Parties to the Protocol in Regional Groupings
- Appendix 13: Table of Acronyms